DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 579 FL 006 194

AUTHOR Filipovic, Rudolf
TITLE The Use of Contrastive and Error Analysis to Practicing Teachers.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 17p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document; Paper presented at the Joint T.1.T.-I.A.T.E.F.L. Conference (Budapest, Hungary, April 9-11, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Applied Linguistics; *Contrastive Linguistics; English (Second Language); Error Patterns; *Interference (Language Learning); *Language Instruction; Language Teachers; Learning Characteristics; Learning Processes; Learning Theories; *Material Development; *Second Language Learning; Serbocroatian
IDENTIFIERS *Error Analysis; *Language Learners Systems

ABSTRACT

A major problem in learning a second language is the interference of a structurally different native language. Contrastive analysis (CA) combined with learner error analysis (EA) provide an excellent basis for preparation of language instructional materials. The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project proved that full application of CA in foreign language teaching can be obtained only if it is combined with EA. In drawing a parallel between linguistic borrowing and foreign language acquisition, a transitory system called a compromise system was proposed; it consists of deviations from the norm of the target language occurring as a learner moves from his native language system to the new language. Specifically, the compromise system consists of (1) deviations in use of English parts of speech and (2) errors in use of main parts of a sentence. The project produced pedagogical materials written with maximum application of the results of both contrastive analysis and error analysis. The teaching methods are based on habit formation and a cognitive approach representing creative language use. The materials progress in five stages from drills through free written and oral expression. Use of both contrastive and error analysis and a compromise system for any two language should produce the best pedagogical materials and the most effective language teaching. (CHK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED122579

JOINT T.I.T. - I.A.T.E.F.L. CONFERENCE - BUDAPEST 9-11 APRIL 1974.

RUDOLF FILIPOVIĆ (University of Zagreb)

THE USE OF CONTRASTIVE AND ERROR ANALYSIS TO PRACTICING TEACHERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Introduction

There have been few conferences or symposia on applied linguistics or foreign language teaching where there was no paper or even a section on CL or CA. Quite a number of papers have been read at such meetings and most of them dealt with interesting topics of CL (and CA, if the two can be distinguished at all). These papers and the topics they discussed definitely made an important contribution to the field of CL and helped add to the importance and value of this new or old (as you like) discipline or branch of linguistics. There is, however, an interesting feature that one notices immediately if one looks at the papers read within the last few years. Very few papers offered direct help to practicing teachers although some of them meant to discuss the application of CA.

One might get a similar impression, although not the same, of contrastive projects, their interest and their work. A majority of their products are far from being practical material intended to help practicing teachers in their classroom work. When I looked back at my own contrastive project, the YSCECP[1], I decided to write a paper about what we have done for practicing teachers of English in Yugoslavia and whether our products[2] can be used by them. I am grateful to Mrs Szentivanyi and Dr. W.R. Lee for giving me an opportunity to have my paper discussed at a conference of practicing teachers of English.

It would be unjust, however, if I did not mention some attempts in the past to describe how languages and cultures could be compared, and whether such a comparison could be applied in foreign language teaching: Lado's book Linguistics Across Cultures[3] seems to be the first attempt to use CA in teaching.

FL00 6194

There have been other linguists who have applied modern linguistic approaches to develop a theoretical basis for CA of various languages[4]. Although this activity proves that CA was gaining ground in linguistics, it began to be widely appreciated only when it started to be used in the field of foreign language teaching.

Starting from the assumption that one of the major problems in the learning of a second language is the interference caused by the structurally different native language and that a careful contrastive analysis of the two languages offers an excellent basis for the preparation of instructional materials and classroom techniques, the Center for Applied Linguistics undertook in 1959 a series of contrastive structure studies under the editorship of Prof. C.A. Ferguson. It was planned to cover five world languages (French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish), with two books each: one volume on sounds and another on grammar. Only three sets (six volumes) covering German[5], Italian[6] and Spanish[7] were published, while three more books (two on French[8] and one on Russian[9]) remained in manuscript form but are available in xerox and microfilm form.

The studies were primarily intended for language teachers and textbook writers in the U.S. They represented a pioneering venture in the field of applied linguistics. The authors and editor believed that in ten years the principles of CA would be more widely recognized and appreciated.[10] However, according to my information from the U.S., the six published volumes have not had any great impact either on FLT in general or on the teaching of the three languages in question. My informants claim that the studies did not help or promote the teaching of the three above mentioned languages directly, nor indirectly through their influence on the writing of textbooks.

The editor's forecast that the principles of CA will be more widely recognized and appreciated in about ten years came true and in 1968 two conferences advertised the value and applicability of CA at both theoretical and applied levels. The first was the 19th Annual Round Table Conference at Georgetown

University which dealt with Contrastive Linguistics and its pedagogical implications[11]. In fact, the topics discussed there ranged from general theoretical ones to CA applications in grammars, language textbooks, and practical teaching.

One group of leading American linguists showed, each in his specific way and within his field and interest, a link between general linguistics and CA. Another group consisting of applied linguists tried to fix the place of CA in the theory and practice of language teaching. This conference, whose papers were printed in the Georgetown University Monograph Series[12], made CA better known in the U.S. and helped it spread both in the U.S. and Europe.

Soon after, at another international meeting of teachers of FL., the FIPLV Congress[13] held in Zagreb in the same year (April 1968), CA was the subject of one section: Contrastive Linguistics and its Pedagogical Implications[14].

The subjects of group discussions ranged from highly technical phases of linguistic theory and contrastive procedures to basic problems of classroom teaching. There again it was agreed that contrastive linguistics could contribute a great deal to language instruction, but that the gap between theoretical study and classroom application was still large.[15]

The importance of this section can be seen in its dissemination of the main ideas and results of the Georgetown conference, as well as in the discussion of European approaches to CA, which were defined in three papers (two dealing with German projects[16] and one with a Polish one[17]). In that same year the Yugoslav S-C-E contrastive project began its organized work on both CA and EA: it paid special attention to the pedagogical value of Contrastive Analysis and to the practical application of the results of EA.[18] It did not, however, neglect theoretical questions, such as the method to be used, whether to use a corpus or not, etc.

2. YSCECP

I will try to show the use of both CA and EA for practicing teachers of English in Yugoslavia. I hope that the same can be done in any other country where there is a contrastive project that pays enough attention to the pedagogical value of CA and whose results are checked and completed by the findings of EA.

At the very start of the project (in 1968) we formed two research groups: one worked on CA, and another worked on EA[19]. For some time they worked separately. As soon as I became aware of limitations on the findings of CA and of advantages of the results achievable by EA, I coordinated their work so that both teams used each other's results[20]. Very often we had the impression that one could not have worked successfully without the other.

The EA investigators when trying to explain the cause of deviation for some items used the basic findings of the CA analysts. And the analysts working on CA quite often consulted the corpus of errors compiled by the EA team workers.

Their cooperation became even more important when we started writing pedagogical materials[21], the practical goal of both teams' work. For each individual topic the results of analyses were combined and actually served as a basis for pedagogical materials, the teaching material used in classes.

This proved that full application of CA in foreign language teaching can be obtained only if it is combined with EA. The authors of the pedagogical materials themselves are practicing teachers of E and are well qualified to prepare the teaching material for classroom work. In this way, it seems to me, the YSCECP has bridged the gap between theoretical study and classroom application and offers practicing teachers of English the most immediate help in their work.

When in 1970 I wrote on CA and EA in Pedagogical Materials[22] to introduce long summaries of three MA theses on Syntactic and Morphological Errors in the Speech of Learners

of English in the S-C-Speaking Area[23] I pointed out that the work on pedagogical implications should be based:

a) on the findings of the contrastive research;
b) on the analysis of errors;
c) on the analyzers' personal experience with errors; and
d) on the knowledge of the specialists in English teaching methods, who know what should be done with learners' errors[24] when teaching English in the S-C-Speaking area.

What I had in mind then was to show how CA and EA should be applied in order to be useful to practicing teachers, which means what a contrastive project that carries out CA and EA can offer to foreign language teachers in their practical work.

3. The Compromise System.

Psycho-linguists (particularly Prof. Slama-Cazacu[25]) tell us that contact analysis - the analysis of systems in contact in the learner, during the process of foreign-language acquisition - is an attempt to overcome certain fundamental shortcomings of CL and CA. These systems, called approximative systems by Dr. William Nemser[26], are still waiting to be investigated on both psycholinguistic and pedagogical levels, as we do not know yet (as Prof. Slama-Cazacu says[27]) exactly what approximative systems are and how they can be studied.

When I tried to draw a parallel between the process of linguistic borrowing and the process of foreign language acquisition, as both are based on interference of one system with another, causing deviations from the norms of either language, I proposed a new concept - a transitory system which I called a compromise system[28]. I based its name on a technical term in linguistic borrowing: phonetic compromise and compromise replica.[29]

What does a compromise system consist of, how do we define it and construct it, how is it linked with a contrastive project, and what is its use for practicing teachers? My compro-

mise system consists of all the deviations from the norm of the target language which occur when a learner passes from the system of his mother tongue to the system of the target language. The best way of studying it is to analyse the errors occurring in the process of learning the target language. That is a thorough error analysis. So by studying and systematizing the errors at all levels (phonological, morphological, systactic, etc.) we shall obtain a transitory system of errors typical of S-C learners of English. Such a system, as artificial as it may look, helps the teachers of English in the S-C-speaking area in developing their teaching strategy in general and teaching tactics for any problem and even for every individual case.

The basic pattern of a compromise system built upon errors made by S-C-speaking learners of English consists of two main sections: a) deviations from the rules in the use of the English parts of speech following the traditional-grammar division, and b) errors in the use of main parts of the sentence (subject, predicate, object, adverbial modifier). In the former section the deviation from the rules in some parts of speech are of both morphological and lexical nature, in others lexical only, due to the limited number of forms in English morphology.

The latter section shows: 1) deviations from correct word-order; 2) omission of elements; 3) repetition of elements; 4) superfluous elements; 5) incorrect embedding of clauses; 6) errors in building constructions smaller than clauses.

This pattern is further worked out into a system as complete as possible. It can serve a practicing teacher as a handbook which he can consult whenever he tries to eradicate an error based on the interference of the mother tongue.

Consequently, in my compromise system there are two groups of mistakes: a) those originating in language transfer which must be given special attention because they are the most frequent and most difficult to eradicate; and b) those originating in other sources than language transfer. This is why I decided from the very start of our Project to carry out research at both levels - CA and EA. I was convinced that a teaching

strategy based on the results of CA and EA (in spite of its possible limitations) is better (for a teacher to use) than a strategy based on intuition which sometimes works and very often does not.

In fact, we work for those teachers who need some help (and they are a great majority) and not for those who do not need it (they are in the minority).

This is not the only application of EA or its only use for practicing teachers. It seems to me that a foreign language teacher should like to know not only the systematized list of errors which can occur in the source-language speaking area but also a list of causes for deviations.

Investigations, made by the authors of the three MA theses (mentioned above), have specified the following causes: 1) Interference from the native language. This is one of the main causes as here we have a conflict between a highly inflected language like S-C and a less inflected one like English; it becomes particularly obvious in sentence structure. 2) Incorrect analogies which a learner tries to establish within the foreign language: he tries to apply a general rule to all cases. 3) Knowing or learning another foreign language can lead the learner to apply the rules of the other language to English. This is particularly common with the use of verbal tenses where for instance knowing or learning the rules for their use in French and German can cause serious deviations. 4) Incomplete mastery of the foreign language system due to the teaching methods used. This cause very often depends not only on the kind of method used but on the organisation of teaching. E.g.: new structures are introduced before the preceding ones have been properly learned, or not enough attention is devoted to mechanical drill which would help form proper habits. 5) A transitional phase when the learner is asked to give up his native language system as a model when speaking the target language, but has not yet mastered well enough the system of the target language. In this phase the stimulus "new" means to him "different from the native language". This may lead to

structures characteristic of neither the mother tongue nor of the target language. This phenomenon must be explained in the compromise system.

To know deviations in the use of English in the S-C-speaking area with their possible causes can be an invaluable and very useful piece of information for every teacher of English in this area. A lot of errors, if we know their nature and origin, could be avoided or corrected with a suitable methodological approach to English teaching and with a proper grading of the teaching material. EA helps achieve the above mentioned goals and this is its main use (but not the only one) for practicing teachers.

4. Pedagogical Materials.

An equally important and valuable use of EA is to complement CA in compiling pedagogical materials. In order to illustrate the use of CA for practicing teachers I will explain here how our pedagogical materials were conceived[30] (in 1968), how they were developed[31] (in 1970), and how they reached (in 1971) the form and pattern they are published in now and will be written in from now on[32].

Pedagogical materials, which represent the most obvious practical result of our project, are being written with maximum application of the results achieved by both CA and EA. We have even put in a third factor which can only add to their applicability: testing[33]. Two types of tests were carried out: the first consisted of demonstrating pedagogical materials under classroom conditions and thus evaluating them in the actual teaching process; the second type aimed at completing EA (carried out earlier, primarily on the spoken corpus) by additional information acquired by means of specially designed written tests. The second type of tests served also to check the basic points of interference discovered by CA analyzers[34] and in this way additional information about types and causes of errors was acquired.

A contrastive grammar of the target language based on the source language may be considered as the first result of CA and EA at a more analytical level; pedagogical materials are meant to supplement it as the result of CA and EA at an applied level. P.M. supply the teacher with teaching material useable in discussing any basic element of contrastive grammar or drilling it at the practicing stage of teaching. Here again we see a very valuable function of P.M. in the teaching process, as textbooks and grammars never supply enough material in discussing and drilling a difficult language structure. P.M. reduce to a minimum the danger of a teacher's following either the old routines or his own intuition.

In order to make P.M. most applicable in the teaching process we had to discuss which approach and method of teaching to choose for the selection and grading of material. Here again we experimented for some time and the first two articles in Pedagogical Materials show which way we went. The first, Teaching Problems in Presenting Modal Verbs,[35] was written before my article "The Role of Linguistics in the Development of Modern Language Teaching"[36] and the second, Teaching Problems in Presenting Relative Pronouns,[37] after. The difference is obvious. While in the first we were still looking for the best solution, in the second my two-degree teaching scheme was applied and proved to be most suitable for further classification of the teaching material.

My scheme is based on two approaches: a) habit formation approach; b) cognitive approach, which represent two degrees in the teaching scheme. The first degree consists of three habit-formation stages, and the second degree, representing the creative use of the language, is made up of two more stages. This particular five-stage scheme covers the process of teaching through a period of ten or more years and can be well applied in Yugoslavia in the case of SC learners of E, who according to the Yugoslav educational system start learning E at the age of ten or slightly earlier.

How is this five-stage scheme applied in writing P.M.?

The P.M. writer collects: a) all the results of CA for a given item, i.e. all the points of interference[38], b) all other sources and causes of mistakes offered by EA[39], and c) all additional material collected in testing[40]. Then he consults frequency counts[41] for the item under investigation. The complete grammatical inventory representing different uses for the item is divided into five stages which cover the teaching process from the beginner's up to a very advanced level. The basis for the hierarchy is the frequency of usage in E.

The methodological justification of my two-degree and five-stage scheme was developed by Mirjana Vilke, our ELT specialist[42]. The material of an item is graded in five stages taking into consideration both frequency and positive and negative transfer, and what is recommended as forms of teaching.

In Stage One the most frequent use of the item is dealt with and in case of positive transfer mechanical drills and short dialogues are applied. In the case of negative transfer, repeated, intensive drills are introduced. In this stage special stress is also laid on the the phonetic aspect of the material.

In Stage Two the material is presented in repetition exercises and intensive pattern practice. Then additional frequent uses of the same grammatical item are introduced. In this stage we insist on phonetic accuracy. Other cases of interference or identified sources of errors are dealt with in intensive mechanical drills.

Stage Three covers medium frequent, but important uses of the same grammatical category. More complicated pattern drills are used. The material of the first two stages is repeated.

As Stage Four represents the beginning of the cognitive approach, mechanical drills will be dropped and combinatory exercises are introduced. In this stage contrastive comparisons between the structures of the L_s and L_t are followed in exercises. All the material learned by an inductive approach to grammatical rules and generalizations is repeated.

In Stage Five we treat all the subcategories of the grammatical unit not included in earlier stages because of low

frequency, or strong interference combined with low frequency. They are worked on in exercises based on free oral and written expressions. Here we have introduced translation exercises from L_s to L_t to test the learner's ability to select the most appropriate form.

An illustration of how this pattern can be applied in preparing the pedagogical material for a grammatical item is to be found in the article written by Mrs. Vilke "Teaching Problems in Presenting Relative Pronouns"[43]. In this article the category of English relative pronouns is organized in such a way that the positive transfer from SC to E relative pronouns is utilized in teaching techniques, while the prevention of negative transfer is taken care of by special drills and exercises. An attempt is made to grade the materials carefully so that the student advances slowly from the material thoroughly learned to more complicated material involving more complex choices. Time prevents me from illustrating the whole procedure; all I can do here is to refer you to Vol. 1. of our publication Pedagogical Materials.

5. Conclusion.

I hope that my paper has illustrated the way in which CA and EA can serve a teacher and help him in the process of language acquisition. This discussion is not exhausted with my paper; it would certainly require further investigation which would add more information on the subject. However, as limited as it may be, my discussion has aimed at showing that adequate pedagogical materials can be obtained only if CA is combined with EA.

The conclusion we can draw from the above discussion is that every contrastive project with practical objectives should be based not only on CA but also on EA and its immediate aim should be not only a new contrastive grammar of the target language based on the learner's mother tongue, but also a compromise system worked out for any two languages on the basis

of error analysis, as well as pedagogical materials written using the results of both CA and EA. In this way, I hope, it becomes clear to everybody that neither of the two kinds of analysis should be neglected or favored at the expense of the other, as they both, CA and EA, each in its own way, but best when combined, can be of great use directly and indirectly for practicing teachers.

N O T E S

1. "The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project So Far", in R. Filipović (ed.), Studies 4: Zagreb Conference on English Contrastive Projects. Institute of Linguistics, Zagreb 1971.

2. Cf. the list of publications: eight volumes of Reports, five volumes of Studies and one volume of Pedagogical Materials. (The list is available from the speaker.)

3. Robert Lado: Linguistics Across Cultures. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1957.

4. a) R. Stockwell: A Contrastive Analysis of English and Tagalog. (Still in manuscript form)

   b) P. Schachter: A Contrastive Analysis of English and Pangasinan. UCLA Press, Los Angeles, 1960. Etc.

5. a) W. Moulton: The Sounds of English and German. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1962.

   b) H. Kufner: The Grammatical Structures of English and German. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1962.

6. a) F. Agard and R. Di Pietro: The Sounds of English and Italian. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1965.

   b) F. Agard and R. Di Pietro: The Grammatical Structures of English and Italian. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1965.

7. a) R. Stockwell and J. Bowen: The Sounds of English and Spanish. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1965.

   b) R. Stockwell, J. Bowen and J. Martin: The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1965.

8. a) S. Lampach and A. Martinet: English-French Contrastive Phonology. (In manuscript)

   b) S. Lampach: Contrastive French Grammar. (In manuscript)

9. W. Gage: The Sounds of English and Russian.(In manuscript)

10. See the general Introduction to the series, p. V.

11. J.E.Alatis (ed.): "Contrastive Linguistics and Its Pedagogical Implications." Georgetown Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics, No. 21, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C. 1968.

12. See Note 11.

13. R. Filipović (ed.): Active Methods and Modern Aids in the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (Papers from the 10th FIPLV Congress in Zagreb 5-9 April 1968). Oxford University Press, London 1972.

14. Section VI: Contrastive Studies. Ibid. pp. 198-226.

15. R. Filipović (ed.): Conclusions and Recommendations of the FIPLV Congress, Zagreb 1968, 14 pp.

16. a) Broder Carstensen: "Contrastive Syntax and Semantics of English and German". In R. Filipović (ed.): Active Methods and Modern Aids in the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Oxford University Press, London 1972, pp. 206-216.

   b) Gerhard Nickel: "Project on Applied Contrastive Linguistics: a Report". Ibid. pp. 217-226

17. J. Fisiak: "Contrastive Studies in the Phonology of English and Polish". (Not printed in the Proceedings.)

18. a) Rudolf Filipović: "A Contrastive Analysis of Serbo-Croatian and English". Studia romanica et anglica zagrabiensia, Zagreb 1967, No. 23, pp. 5-27.

    b) Rudolf Filipović: The Organization and Objectives of the Project. The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project. Institute of Linguistics, Zagreb 1968, 17 pp.

19. The CA group was organized in the Institute of Linguistics of Zagreb University, the EA group worked in the Zagreb Postgraduate School in Linguistics.

20. I reported about it in my paper read at the AILA Conference in Cambridge, in 1969.

21. I specified their value and applicability in my Cambridge paper in September 1969 and later at the Zagreb Conference of Contrastive Projects in December 1970. In R. Filipović (ed.) Studies 4: Zagreb Conference on English Contrastive Projects 7-9 December 1970. (Papers and Discussion). Zagreb 1971, pp. 60-61.

22. R. Filipović: "Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis in Pedagogical Materials". In: R. Filipović (ed.), Pedagogical Materials 1., Zagreb 1971, pp. 1-6.

23. Since there was little chance for the three theses to be published, I decided to make their main results available by printing long summaries in R. Filipović (ed.), Pedagogical Materials 1., Zagreb 1971.
    Vera Andrassy: "Errors in the Morphology and Syntax of the Parts of Speech in the English of Learners from the Serbo-Croatian-Speaking Area". Ibid., pp. 7-31.
    Jasna Bilinić: "Errors in Morphology and Syntax of the Verb in the Speech of Learners of English in the Serbo-Croatian-Speaking Area". Ibid., pp. 32-59.

Stanka Kranjčević: "Errors in the Syntax of the Sentence in the Speech of Learners of English in the Serbo-Croatian-Speaking Area". Ibid., pp. 60-80.

24. Ibid., p. 1.

25. T. Slama-Cazacu: "Psycholinguistics and Contrastive Studies". In R. Filipović (ed.), Studies 4: Zagreb Conference on English Contrastive Projects, Zagreb 1971., pp. 188-225.

26. William Nemser: "Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners". In R. Filipović (ed.), Studies 1, Zagreb 1969, pp. 3-12. Also in: IRAL, Vol. IX/2, Julius Groos Verlag, Heidelberg 1971.

27. T. Slama-Cazacu: o.c., p. 217.

28. R. Filipović: "A Compromise System. A Link between Linguistic Borrowing and Foreign Language Learning". In: R. Filipović (ed.), The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project, Studies 5, Zagreb 1972, pp. 19-29. Also in: IRAL-SONDERBAND, Kongressbericht der 3. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für angewandte Linguistik GAL e.V. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Nickel und Albert Raasch. Julius Groos Verlag, Heidelberg 1972.

29. R. Filipović: "Compromise Replica and Phonemic Importation". To Honor Roman Jakobson. Mouton, 1968, pp. 662-666.

30. R. Filipović: The Organization and Objectives of the Project, Institute of Linguistics, Zagreb 1968, p. 14.
R. Filipović: "The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project", In: G. Nickel (ed.) Papers in Contrastive Linguistics, Cambridge University Press 1971, p. 111.

31. R. Filipović: "CA and EA in Pedagogical Materials". In: R. Filipović (ed.), Pedagogical Materials 1, Zagreb 1971, pp. 1-6.

R. Filipović: "The Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project So Far". In: R. Filipović (ed.), Studies 4: Zagreb Conference on English Contrastive Projects 7-9 December 1970, Zagreb 1971, pp. 60-61.

32. To appear in Studies 6.

33. R. Filipović: "The YSCECP So Far". In: R. Filipović (ed.), Studies 4: Zagreb Conference on English Contrastive Projects 7-9 December 1970, Zagreb 1971, pp. 31-80.

34. R. Filipović: "Testing the Results of Contrastive Analysis". A paper read at the 3rd AILA Congress in Copenhagen, 1972. (To appear in the Congress Proceedings).

35. Mirjana Vilke: "Teaching Problems in Presenting Modal Verbs" In: R. Filipović (ed.), Pedagogical Materials 1, Zagreb 1971, pp. 81-97.

36. R. Filipović: "Udio lingvistike u formiranju modernih metoda u nastavi stranih jezika" (The Role of Linguistics in the Development of Modern Language Teaching). Pedagoški rad, Zagreb 1970, XXV, 7-8, pp. 375-391.

37. Mirjana Vilke: "Teaching Problems in Presenting Relative Pronouns". In: R. Filipović (ed.), Pedagogical Materials 1, Zagreb 1971, pp. 98-111.

38. They can be found in our publications Reports and Studies.

39. They are found in the three MA theses.

40. We plan to print the results of the testing in our publications.

41. H.V.George: Verb-Form Frequency Count, Central Institute of English, Hyderabad 1963. See also: ELT, Vol. 18, No. 1, Oct 1963, pp. 31-37.

42. Her article will appear soon in Studies 6.

43. Pedagogical Materials 1, pp. 98-111.